

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 61-115 were pending in this application.

Claims 71-73, 91-93, and 104-106 were previously withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1, 61-70, 74-90, 94-103, and 107-115 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 61, 65, 66, 68, 70, 72-74, 77-82, 85-88, 90, 92-97, 99-101, 103, 105, 106, and 108-115 have been amended as shown above.

Claims 62 and 67 have been cancelled.

Claims 116 and 117 have been added.

Claims 1, 61, 63-66, and 68-117 are now pending in this application.

Reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action rejects Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Applicant has amended Claim 1 as shown above. Among other things, these amendments remove the claim elements forming the basis of the § 112 rejection.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 112 rejection.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND § 103

The Office Action rejects Claims 61, 63-66, 68-70, 80-88, 90, 94-101, 103, and 108-115 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,354,331 to Schachar

("Schachar"). The Office Action rejects Claims 61-70, 74-79, 89, 102, and 107 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Schachar*. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

A prior art reference anticipates a claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102 only if every element of the claimed invention is identically shown in that single reference, arranged as they are in the claims. (*MPEP* § 2131; *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 832, 15 U.S.P.Q.2d 1566, 1567 (Fed. Cir. 1990)). Anticipation is only shown where each and every limitation of the claimed invention is found in a single prior art reference. (*MPEP* § 2131; *In re Donohue*, 766 F.2d 531, 534, 226 U.S.P.Q. 619, 621 (Fed. Cir. 1985)).

In *ex parte* examination of patent applications, the Patent Office bears the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. (*MPEP* § 2142; *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 1262, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992)). The initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* basis to deny patentability to a claimed invention is always upon the Patent Office. (*MPEP* § 2142; *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Piasecki*, 745 F.2d 1468, 1472, 223 U.S.P.Q. 785, 788 (Fed. Cir. 1984)). Only when a *prima facie* case of obviousness is established does the burden shift to the Applicant to produce evidence of nonobviousness. (*MPEP* § 2142; *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1532, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). If the Patent Office does not produce a *prima facie* case of unpatentability, then without more the Applicant is entitled to grant of a patent. (*In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 U.S.P.Q.2d 1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992); *In re Grabiak*, 769 F.2d 729, 733, 226 U.S.P.Q. 870, 873 (Fed. Cir. 1985)).

Regarding the discussion in *Schachar* of a “scleral alloplant,” all portions of *Schachar* mentioning the alloplant are reproduced below:

The diameter of the sclera overlying the ciliary body can also be increased by making a complete periglobular incision and grafting into the incision appropriate tissue and/or physiologically acceptable structural material to increase the dimensions of the sclera. Thus an artificial scleral alloplant made of purified human collagen may be engrafted into such an incision. Other known biocompatible materials, e.g., poly(ethylene terephthalate), that are conventionally used in the construction of prosthetic devices may also be used for engrafting into such an incision. It is also possible to excise a small strip of sclera from the region overlying the ciliary body and replace it with a scleral alloplant as described above to provide an appropriate increase in the diameter of this region. (*Col. 8, Lines 12-26*) (underlining added).

This portion of *Schachar* first refers to implanting a scleral alloplant into a “complete periglobular incision.” The use of the prefix “peri” in the term “periglobular” indicates that the incision is formed completely “around” the globe, based on the standard definition of “peri” (another definition of “peri” is “near,” which cannot be the correct definition here since an incision “near” the globe of the eye would not actually be formed in the eye). As a result, this portion of *Schachar* specifically teaches forming an incision around the entire globe of the eye.

Once that incision is formed, an alloplant is engrafted into the complete periglobular incision. Nothing in *Schachar* describes any structure of the alloplant. At most, *Schachar* might teach or suggest that the alloplant is in the shape of a complete circle or ring (as is the scleral band disclosed in *Schachar*).

This portion of *Schachar* then refers to excising a small strip of sclera from the eye and replacing the strip with the same “scleral alloplant as described above.” In other words, this part

of *Schachar* refers to the same alloplant, not a second or different alloplant. Again, at most, *Schachar* might teach or suggest that the alloplant is in the shape of a complete circle or ring, and nothing in *Schachar* describes any structure of the alloplant.

In contrast, the independent claims have been amended to refer to specific surface shapes. For example, Claim 1 recites a prosthesis with two “free ends,” one surface that is “planar,” and an opposing surface that includes “a ridge or a crest separated from the planar surface.” Since *Schachar* provides absolutely no description of any structure of the alloplant, none of these features are taught or suggested by *Schachar*.

Similarly, Claims 61, 74, and 109 refer to a prosthesis with two “free ends,” a “planar” surface, and “a ridge or a crest” on a different surface. Claim 80 refers to a body having two “free ends” and a “ridge projecting above surrounding portions of the body,” where the ridge is located between “first and second edges of the body” and extends along “at least a majority of a length of the body from the first free end to the second free end.” Claim 94 refers to a “base member” having an elongated planform with an “inner major surface” and a “planar outer major surface,” where a “ridge member” is on the inner major surface. Claim 108 refers to an “arcuate base” that is “planar” and that has a “length that forms less than a complete circle,” where there is a “ridge on a surface of the base.” Again, since *Schachar* provides absolutely no description of any structure of the alloplant, none of these features are taught or suggested by *Schachar*.

Regarding the assertion that the scleral band of *Schachar* can anticipate the claims, every single independent claim includes language that cannot be taught or suggested by the scleral band of *Schachar*. Claims 1, 80, and 109 recite that a body is “non-circular” and has two “free

ends.” This structure cannot be taught or suggested by the complete circular band of *Schachar*.

Claim 61 recites that an elongated body has multiple “free ends,” where a first free end is “more distal” from a second free end “than from any other portion of the elongated body.” Claim 74 recites that a body has multiple “free ends” that are “adapted to be free of contact with any other prosthesis when the prosthesis is implanted,” where the body has “no portions that are spaced apart from each other further than the first and second free ends.” Neither of these structures are taught or suggested by the complete circular band of *Schachar*.

Claim 94 recites a “non-circular” body, and Claim 108 recites an “arcuate base” that has a “length forming less than a complete circle.” Once again, this cannot be taught or suggested by the complete circular band of *Schachar*.

For these reasons, *Schachar* fails to anticipate or suggest the Applicant’s invention as recited in all pending independent claims (and their dependent claims). Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 102 and § 103 rejections and full allowance of all pending claims.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant respectfully asserts that all pending claims in this application are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests full allowance of the claims.


If any issues arise or if the Examiner has any suggestions for expediting allowance of this application, the Applicant respectfully invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at *wmunck@munckcarter.com*.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

MUNCK CARTER, LLP

Date: April 30, 2009



William A. Munck
Registration No. 39,308

P.O. Drawer 800889
Dallas, Texas 75380
(972) 628-3621 (direct dial)
(972) 628-3600 (main number)
(972) 628-3616 (fax)
E-mail: *wmunck@munckcarter.com*